

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/662,608	09/15/2003		Juanito B. Calagui		2343		
7	590	11/29/2005		EXAMINER			
Mr. Walter J.	Tencza	Jr.	COE, SUSAN D				
Suite 3 10 Station Place	e			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Metuchen, NJ 08840				1655			

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary			08	CALAGUI, JUANITO B.					
			· ·	Art Unit					
		Susan D.		1655					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication reply	n appears on the	cover sheet with the d	correspondence	address				
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPORTED IN THE MAILING IN THE MAILIN	IG DATE OF THE FR 1.136(a). In no evon. Deriod will apply and w statute, cause the app	HIS COMMUNICATION ent, however, may a reply be tir ill expire SIX (6) MONTHS from lication to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on								
		This action is n	on-final.						
′=	Since this application is in condition for all			osecution as to t	he merits is				
,	closed in accordance with the practice un		•	:					
		,		;					
Disposit	on of Claims			:					
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application	ation.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.			:					
7)	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8)[	Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	and/or election r	equirement.	; :					
Applicati	on Papers			: :					
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner							
·	The drawing(s) filed on <u>15 September 200</u>		ccepted or b) object	ted to by the Ex	aminer				
. 4/63	Applicant may not request that any objection to	•		-	•				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co		•	• • •					
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	· ·	=	-	, ,				
				:					
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			:					
• —	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			)-(d) or (f).					
	1. Certified copies of the priority docu								
	2. Certified copies of the priority docu								
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the	•		ed in this Nation	al Stage				
	application from the International B	•	* **	: :					
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a	a list of the certi	fied copies not receive	∍d.					
Attachmen	, ,								
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94	8)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D						
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S		5) Notice of Informal F		PTO-152)				
Pape	r No(s)/Mail Date		6) Other:	:					

Application/Control Number: 10/662,608 Page 2

Art Unit: 1655

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-20 are currently pending.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, 13-16, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Appendix A: Making a Good Cup of Tea (http://ubiqx.org/cifs/Appendix-A.html (2001)) hereinafter referred to as "tea website."

The tea website teaches a method for making tea. Loose tea is added to a teapot. Water is boiled and then added to the teapot that contains the tea. The tea is brewed for about four minutes. The brewed tea is then strained. The reference does not specifically teach using the amounts of water and tea claimed; however, the reference does teach that the amount of tea can be varied according to the taste of the drinker (see page 1). Thus, the amount of water and tea to use are clearly result effective parameters that a person of ordinary skill in the art would routinely optimize. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Thus, optimization of general conditions is a routine practice that would be obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ. It would have been customary for an artisan of ordinary skill to determine the optimal

amount of tea and water to use in order to best achieve the desired taste of the tea. Thus, absent some demonstration of unexpected results from the claimed parameters, this optimization of ingredient amount would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention.

The reference also does not specifically teach consuming the before breakfast and/or dinner. However, tea is an extremely common beverage. This beverage is known to be consumed at meal times or whenever desired by the user. Thus, consuming this beverage at any time is considered obvious. In addition, the reference does not specifically teach consuming the tea at the temperatures claimed by applicant. However, the temperature of a beverage is clearly a result effective parameter that would routinely be varied to suit the individual taste of the tea drinker. Thus, this variation in tea temperature is considered obvious.

3. Claims 5, 10, 12, 17, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over tea website as applied to claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, 13-16 and 19 above, and further in view of "Trends in Japan" website (<a href="http://web-japan.org/trends01/article/020612soc\_r.html">http://web-japan.org/trends01/article/020612soc\_r.html</a> (June 12, 2002)).

The teachings of the tea website are discussed above. The reference does not specifically teach placing the tea in a plastic bottle. The Trends in Japan website teaches that it was known in the art at the time of the invention that plastic bottles are used for tea (see page 2). Thus, a person of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably expect that tea can be placed in plastic bottles. This reasonable expectation would motivate a person of ordinary skill in the art to use plastic bottles for the tea brewed according to the teachings of the tea website.

Application/Control Number: 10/662,608

Art Unit: 1655

## **Double Patenting**

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

- 4. Claims 1-20 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 10/601,684. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.
- 5. No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Coe whose telephone number is (571) 272-0963. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 9:30 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey, can be reached at (571) 272-0775. The official fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding can be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Art Unit: 1655

Monn D. We 11-22-05

Susan D. Coe Primary Examiner Art Unit 1655